



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/649,008	08/26/2003	Gordon Short	SFTO0001	5928
22862	7590	08/24/2006	EXAMINER	
GLENN PATENT GROUP 3475 EDISON WAY, SUITE L MENLO PARK, CA 94025			PYO, MONICA M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2161	
DATE MAILED: 08/24/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/649,008	SHORT ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Monica M. Pyo	2161	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 June 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

***DETAILED ACTION***

1. This communication is responsive to the Amendment filed 6/8/2006.
2. Claims 1-36 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 14-15, 19 and 32-33 are independent claims. In the Amendment filed 6/8/2006, claims 1-5, 7, 9, 11, 13-17, 19-23, 25, 27 and 31-33 were amended. This action is made Final.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The claim amendment received on 6/8/2006. The changes are acknowledged and accepted. Therefore, the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejections made in a prior Office Action are withdrawn.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 2161

5. Claims 1-8, 14-15, 19-26, 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,829,613 issued to Liddy (hereafter Liddy) and in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,006,221 issued to Liddy et al. (hereafter Paik).

Claims 1 & 19:

Regarding Claims 1 and 19, Liddy discloses a process for real time analysis of any of text and media content and relating information to the content, comprising the steps of:

- analyzing said content in real time, as a distributed information, as a semantic building model in real-time (Liddy: col. 5, lns. 46-56; col. 7, lns. 51-60);
- wherein said analyzing step analyzes said content for semantic and conceptual use, as a semantic and a natural language processing information retrieval system (Liddy: col. 6, lns. 53-63; col. 10, lns. 54-65);
- providing a set of reference documents, as a message category semantic model (Liddy: col. 5, lns. 46-66; col. 8, lns. 16-26);
- wherein said reference documents comprise any of text, Web, and media documents, as a outgoing message can have either a text or a web forms (Liddy: col. 5, lns. 50-67; col. 6, lns. 1-4; col. 7, lns. 57-60; col. 8, lns. 5-15);
- providing a analysis of said reference documents, as the compared message categories are to determine a degree of similarity (Liddy: col. 6, lns. 15-26; col. 8, lns. 16-29);
- wherein said analysis is an analysis of said reference documents for semantic and conceptual use, as a semantic relations and a use of natural language processing information retrieval system (Liddy: col. 6, lns. 53-65; col. 8, lns. 16-29)

Art Unit: 2161

- identifying reference documents related to said analyzed content using said analysis, as a indication of synonymous phrasing of the topic (Liddy: col. 7, lns. 5-26);
- providing a user with a description of each identified reference document, as a text segments output by the system providing examples of the topic (Liddy: col. 7, lns. 20-38);

Liddy does not specifically discloses:

- pre-processed analysis
- accepting user input for selecting an identified reference document; and
- displaying the selected identified reference document to the user

However, Paik discloses:

- pre-processed analysis, as a use of the preprocessor 100 (Paik: col. 8, lns. 40-53)
- accepting user input for selecting an identified reference document, as a interaction between the user and the software (Paik: col. 6, lns. 29-47); and
- displaying the selected identified reference document to the user, as progressing the matched document by using a graphical user interface (Paik: col. 6, lns. 43-62).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to apply the document retrieval system of Paik into the technique for controlling the information distribution of Liddy. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to incorporate the Paik's teaching of document retrieval system in the Liddy's information control distribution system to enter a query and retrieve document from a database (Paik: col. 2, lns. 6-16).

Claim 19 is also rejected based upon the same reasoning as Claim 1.

Claims 2 & 20:

Regarding Claims 2 and 20, Liddy and Paik disclose the process wherein said identifying step identifies related reference documents by finding reference documents that are similar in words, semantically or conceptually, to the analyzed content (Liddy: col. 6, lns. 53-65; col. 7, lns. 28-38; col. 9, lns. 51-58; col. 10, lns. 54-65; fig. 6) & (Paik: col. 5, lns. 65-67; col. 6, lns. 1-12).

Claim 20 is also rejected based upon the same reasoning as Claim 2.

Claims 3 & 21:

Regarding Claims 3 and 21, Liddy and Paik disclose the process further comprising the step of:

- storing descriptors for each reference document (Liddy: col. 11, lns. 25-45 – Liddy discloses Natural Language Processing Information Retrieval (NLPIR) system).
- retrieving descriptions of each identified reference document from said stored descriptors (Liddy: col. 7, lns. 5-38)

Claim 21 is also rejected based upon the same reasoning as Claim 3.

Claims 4 & 22:

Regarding Claims 4 and 22, Liddy and Paik disclose the process wherein said set of reference documents are stored in a central storage device (Liddy: col. 11, lns. 34-57; fig. 6).

Claim 22 is also rejected based upon the same reasoning as Claim 4.

Claims 5 & 23:

Regarding Claims 5 and 23, Liddy and Paik disclose the process wherein said pre-processed analysis creates a list of words and calculates the frequency that the words appear in said set of reference documents (Liddy: col. 8, lns. 41-67; col. 9, lns. 1-11) & (Paik: col. 6, lns. 52-63).

Claim 23 is also rejected based upon the same reasoning as Claim 5.

Claims 6 & 24:

Regarding Claims 6 and 24, Liddy and Paik disclose the process wherein said pre-processed analysis translates similar words into the same word (Liddy: col. 6, lns. 15-26; fig.4) & (Paik: col. 21, lns. 60-67; col. 22, lns. 1-14).

Claim 24 is also rejected based upon the same reasoning as Claim 6.

Claims 7 & 25:

Regarding Claims 7 and 25, Liddy and Paik disclose the process wherein said pre-processed analysis generates collocations of words that appear together and calculates the frequency of pairs of words and the frequency of the words appearing together in said reference documents (Liddy: col. 9, lns. 1-11) & (Paik: col. 8, lns. 42-53 & 59-67; col. 11, lns. 7-24).

Claim 25 is also rejected based upon the same reasoning as Claim 7.

Claims 8 & 26:

Regarding Claims 8 and 26, Liddy and Paik disclose the process wherein said pre-processed analysis finds relations between collocations to learn their meaning/context (Paik: col. 8, lns. 42-50; col. 11, lns. 7-26).

Claim 26 is also rejected based upon the same reasoning as Claim 8.

Claims 14 & 32:

Regarding Claims 14 and 32, Liddy discloses a process for real time analysis of any of text and media content in a workflow application and relating information to the content, comprising the steps of:

- automatically analyzing said content in real time as said content is being entered or reviewed by a user, as a user interface to query and display (Liddy: col. 8, lns. 58-65; col. 10, lns. 35-53; col. 11, lns. 58-65) ;
- wherein said analyzing step analyzes said content for semantic and conceptual use, as a distributed information (Liddy: col. 5, lns. 46-56; col. 7, lns. 51-60);
- providing a set of reference documents, as a message category semantic model (Liddy: col. 5, lns. 46-66; col. 8, lns. 16-26);
- wherein said reference documents comprise any of text, Web, and media documents, as a outgoing message can have either a text or a web forms (Liddy: col. 5, lns. 50-67; col. 6, lns. 1-4; col. 7, lns. 57-60; col. 8, lns. 5-15);
- providing a analysis of said reference documents, as the compared message categories are to determine a degree of similarity (Liddy: col. 6, lns. 15-26; col. 8, lns. 16-29);
- wherein said analysis is an analysis of said reference documents for semantic and conceptual use, as a semantic relations and a use of natural language processing information retrieval system (Liddy: col. 6, lns. 53-65; col. 8, lns. 16-29)
- identifying reference documents related to said analyzed content using said analysis, as a indication of synonymous phrasing of the topic (Liddy: col. 7, lns. 5-26);



Art Unit: 2161

- wherein said identifying step identifies related reference documents by finding reference documents that are similar in words, semantically or conceptually to said metadata, as a collection of text segments relevant and do comparison (Liddy: col. 7, lns. 5-26 & 61-67; col. 9, lns. 38-58; col. 10, lns. 54-65);
- providing a user with a description of each identified reference document, as a text segments output by the system providing examples of the topic (Liddy: col. 7, lns. 20-38);

Liddy does not specifically discloses:

- pre-processed analysis
- accepting user input for selecting an identified reference document; and
- displaying the selected identified reference document to the user.

However, Paik discloses:

- pre-processed analysis, as a use of the preprocessor 100 (Paik: col. 8, lns. 40-53)
- accepting user input for selecting an identified reference document, as a interaction between the user and the software (Paik: col. 6, lns. 29-47); and
- displaying the selected identified reference document to the user, as progressing the matched document by using a graphical user interface (Paik: col. 6, lns. 43-62).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to apply the document retrieval system of Paik into the technique for controlling the information distribution of Liddy. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to incorporate the

Art Unit: 2161

Paik's teaching of document retrieval system in the Liddy's information control distribution system to enter a query and retrieve document from a database (Paik: col. 2, lns. 6-16).

Claim 32 is also rejected based upon the same reasoning as Claim 14.

Claims 15 & 33:

Regarding Claims 15 and 33, Liddy discloses a process for real time analysis of text and/or media content and relating information to the content, comprising the steps of:

- extracting metadata from said media content in real time as said content is being viewed by a user, as a parsing of the outgoing message to extract meta-information (Liddy: col. 7, lns. 54-67; col. 10, lns. 35-53; col. 11, lns. 66-67);
- providing a set of reference documents, as a message category semantic model (Liddy: col. 5, lns. 46-66; col. 8, lns. 16-26);
- wherein said reference documents comprise any of text, Web, and media documents, as a outgoing message can have either a text or a web forms (Liddy: col. 5, lns. 50-67; col. 6, lns. 1-4; col. 7, lns. 57-60; col. 8, lns. 5-15);
- providing a analysis of said reference documents, as the compared message categories are to determine a degree of similarity (Liddy: col. 6, lns. 15-26; col. 8, lns. 16-29);
- wherein said analysis is an analysis of said reference documents for semantic and conceptual use, as a semantic relations and a use of natural language processing information retrieval system (Liddy: col. 6, lns. 53-65; col. 8, lns. 16-29)

Art Unit: 2161

- identifying reference documents related to said analyzed content using said analysis, as a indication of synonymous phrasing of the topic (Liddy: col. 7, lns. 5-26);
- wherein said identifying step identifies related reference documents by finding reference documents that are similar in words, semantically or conceptually to said metadata, as a collection of text segments relevant and do comparison (Liddy: col. 7, lns. 5-26 & 61-67; col. 9, lns. 38-58; col. 10, lns. 54-65);
- providing a user with a description of each identified reference document, as a text segments output by the system providing examples of the topic (Liddy: col. 7, lns. 20-38);

Liddy does not specifically discloses:

- pre-processed analysis
- accepting user input for selecting an identified reference document; and
- displaying the selected identified reference document to the user

However, Paik discloses:

- pre-processed analysis, as a use of the preprocessor 100 (Paik: col. 8, lns. 40-53)
- accepting user input for selecting an identified reference document, as a interaction between the user and the software (Paik: col. 6, lns. 29-47); and
- displaying the selected identified reference document to the user, as progressing the matched document by using a graphical user interface (Paik: col. 6, lns. 43-62).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to apply the document retrieval system of Paik into the technique for controlling the information distribution of Liddy. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to incorporate the Paik's teaching of document retrieval system in the Liddy's information control distribution system to enter a query and retrieve document from a database (Paik: col. 2, lns. 6-16).

Claim 33 is also rejected based upon the same reasoning as Claim 15.

6. Claims 9-12 and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liddy in view of Paik as applied to claims 1-8, 14-15, 19-26, 32 and 33 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,718,367 issued to Ayyadurai (hereafter Ayyadurai).

Claims 9 & 27:

Regarding Claims 9 and 27, Liddy and Paik disclose the process wherein said pre-processed analysis uses wherein a vector of words and their weighting within an reference document; wherein the weighting is determined by the importance of a word in the collocations and within the document (Paik: col. 8, lns. 42-53; col. 15, lns. 3-17).

Liddy in view of Paik do not disclose: a signature algorithm to calculate signatures for blocks of text,

However, Ayyadurai discloses: a signature algorithm to calculate signatures for blocks of text (Ayyadurai: col. 4, lns. 27-43; fig. 1),

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to apply the signature block of Ayyadurai into the document retrieval system of Paik and the technique for controlling the information distribution of Liddy to utilize stream analysis

for broadcast information. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to incorporate the Ayyadurai's teaching of utilizing the signature block of text in the Paik's document retrieval system and the Liddy's information control distribution system to find practical use of an automated system email and text based messages, as suggested by Ayyadurai, which discloses "allow a user to review the initial characterization and classification of individual messages through a user interface" (Ayyadurai: col. 3, lns. 47-63).

Claim 27 is also rejected based upon the same reasoning as Claim 9.

Claims 10 & 28:

Regarding Claims 10 and 28, Liddy and Paik and Ayyadurai disclose the process wherein said pre-processed analysis calculates signatures for Web pages, text tags associated with images, and blocks of text (Liddy: col. 11, lns. 26-45), (Paik: col. 8, lns. 42-53) & (Ayyadurai: col. 4, lns. 27-43; fig. 1).

Claim 28 is also rejected based upon the same reasoning as Claim 10.

Claims 11 & 29:

Regarding Claims 11 and 29, Liddy and Paik and Ayyadurai disclose the process wherein said pre-processed analysis creates an index for each word from a signature vector for an reference document and saves the index, word, text document, and weight of the word into a database that is used to find text documents that have similar signatures (Liddy: col. 11, lns. 26-45 & 66-67; col. 12, lns. 1-16), (Paik: col. 8, lns. 42-53; col. 15, lns. 3-17) & (Ayyadurai: col. 4, lns. 27-43; fig. 1).

Claim 29 is also rejected based upon the same reasoning as Claim 11.

Claims 12 & 30:

Art Unit: 2161

Regarding Claims 12 and 30, Liddy and Paik and Ayyadurai disclose the process wherein said pre-processed analysis uses the signatures and weights of the words to create sets of documents that have similar signatures (Paik: col. 8, lns. 42-53; col. 15, lns. 3-17) & (Ayyadurai: col. 4, lns. 27-43; fig. 1) .

Claim 30 is also rejected based upon the same reasoning as Claim 12.

7. Claims 13, 16-18, 31 and 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liddy in view of Paik as applied to claims 1-8, 14-15, 19-26, 32 and 33 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,816,858 issued to Coden et al. (hereafter Coden).

Claims 13 & 31:

Regarding Claims 13 and 31, Liddy and Paik disclose the process further comprising the step of: collecting text documents from Web pages across the Internet using a Web crawler and placing them into said set of reference documents (Liddy: col. 3, lns. 66-67; col. 4, lns. 1-19; col. 7, lns. 51-60) & (Paik: col. 11, lns. 7-24; col. 13, lns. 42-47).

Liddy in view of Paik do not disclose: and multimedia

However, Coden discloses: and multimedia (Coden: col. 11, lns. 8-25).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the use of collateral information for a video and audio system of Coden into the document retrieval system of Paik and the technique for controlling the information distribution of Liddy to utilize stream analysis for broadcast information. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to incorporate the Coden's teaching of collateral information for a video and audio system into the Paik's document retrieval system and the Liddy's information control

Art Unit: 2161

distribution system to fully operate in real-time and add relevant collateral information to live programming, as suggested by Coden, which discloses “The system is fully automatic and operates in real time, allowing broadcasters to add relevant collateral information to live programming” (Coden: see Abstract).

Claim 31 is also rejected based upon the same reasoning as Claim 13.

Claims 16 & 34:

Regarding Claims 16 and 34, Liddy and Paik disclose the process specifies their relevance to be used said identifying step (Liddy: col. 7, lns. 5-20) & (Paik: col. 7, lns. 48-56).

Liddy in view of Paik do not disclose: wherein a broadcaster provides customized reference documents and.

However, Coden discloses: wherein a broadcaster provides customized reference documents and (Coden: col. 3, lns. 1-13; col. 6, lns. 13-33);

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the use of collateral information for a video and audio system of Coden into the document retrieval system of Paik and the technique for controlling the information distribution of Liddy to utilize stream analysis for broadcast information. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to incorporate the Coden’s teaching of collateral information for a video and audio system into the Paik’s document retrieval system and the Liddy’s information control distribution system to fully operate in real-time and add relevant collateral information to live programming, as suggested by Coden, which discloses “The system is fully automatic and operates in real time, allowing broadcasters to add relevant collateral information to live programming” (Coden: see Abstract).

Claim 34 is also rejected based upon the same reasoning as Claim 16.

Claims 17 & 35:

Regarding Claims 17 and 35, Liddy and Paik disclose the process wherein a producer of said media content provides customized reference documents and specifies their relevance to be used by said identifying step (Liddy: col. 7, lns. 5-20), (Paik: col. 7, lns. 48-56) & (Codan: col. 3, lns. 1-13 & 39-45; col. 6, lns. 13-23).

Claim 35 is also rejected based upon the same reasoning as Claim 17.

Claims 18 & 36:

Regarding Claim 18, Liddy and Paik disclose the process wherein said extracting step creates metadata for said media content by analyzing said media content if said media content does not have associated in-band metadata (Liddy: col. 10, lns. 35-53; col. 11, lns. 66-67; col. 12, lns. 1-34; fig. 6) & (Codan: col. 6, lns. 13-23).

Claim 36 is also rejected based upon the same reasoning as Claim 18.

***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments filed 6/8/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As defined by Answer.com information is knowledge derived from study, experience, or instruction. Liddy teaches the limitation "providing informational documents..." as classifying the information carrying message into one or more categories based on the contents of the message (col. 5, lines 59-62). Applicant's broadly claim "providing informational document..." also reads on Liddy's teaching of classifying the outgoing message based on the degree of



similarity obtained from the comparison performed in step 56 (col. 6, lines 8-13). Hence, Liddy teaches the limitation as claimed.

In response to applicant's argument that Liddy does not disclose "informational documents comprise any of text, web and media documents", the Examiner disagrees. Liddy disclose in col. 5, lns. 67-col. 6, lns. 2 that "The message categories along text describing the message categories are usually provided by the user of the present invention." Liddy also discloses in col. 7, lns. 9-10 that "The document collection typically contains documents, texts, etc." Additionally, Liddy continues to disclose the example of a message category (i.e., military procedure documents, etc) which teaches that above informational documents are, in fact written in texts (col. 7, lns. 13-16).

Applicant argues that "there is absolutely no teaching or suggestion that the "KNOW-IT" system has the capability of providing a user with a description of an identified informational document." However, the Examiner disagrees. Liddy teaches in col. 7, lns. 20-23 the use of the "text segments output by the natural language processing information retrieval system expands the representation of the message category description by providing examples of the topic, by indicating synonymous phrasing of the topic, etc."

Applicant also argues that the Examiner cited col. 8, lns. 40-53 of Paik for "accepting user input for selecting an identified informational document." However, the Examiner has cited col. 6, lns. 37-43 for the above claimed limitation. The Examiner also suggests to read the col. 6, lns. 1-9.

Applicant continues to argue that Paik does not teach "displaying the selected informational document to the user." However, the Examiner disagrees. First, the feature of

Art Unit: 2161

“actual document” which applicant argue is not recited in claim and second, Paik does not specifically disclose nor imply “the result presented to user” are not “the selected informational document”. Therefore, it is perfectly valid to assume that the Paik’s teaching of “the result presented to user” would read on “the selected informational document”.

***Conclusion***

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Monica M. Pyo whose telephone number is 571-272-8192. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 6:30 - 3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner’s supervisor, Jeffrey Gaffin can be reached on 571-272-4146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Monica M Pyo  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2161

8/14/06

*Leslie Wong*  
*Primary Examiner*